```
MBAYNIKC
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
      -----x
 2
3
     NIKE, INC,
 4
                    Plaintiff,
                                            22 Civ. 983 (VEC) (SN)
5
                V.
6
     STOCKX LLC,
 7
                    Defendant.
8
                                             New York, N.Y.
                                             November 10, 2022
9
                                             10:45 a.m.
10
     Before:
11
                        HON. VALERIE E. CAPRONI,
12
                                             District Judge
13
                               APPEARANCES
14
     DLA PIPER LLP
15
          Attorneys for Plaintiff
     BY: MARC E. MILLER
          TAMAR Y. DUVDEVANI
16
          GABRIELLE VELKES
17
     DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON LLP
18
          Attorneys for Defendant
19
     BY: MEGAN KATHLEEN BANNIGAN
          KATHRYN CAMPBELL SABA
20
          HANNAH BEATTIE
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	(Case called)
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your
3	appearance for the record.
4	MR. MILLER: Good morning, your Honor. Marc miller on
5	behalf of Plaintiff Nike.
6	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Miller.
7	MS. DUVDEVANI: Good morning, your Honor. Tamara
8	Duvdevani.
9	THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Duvdevani.
10	MS. VELKES: And Gabrielle Velkes.
11	THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Vehicles. The front
12	table can sit down.
13	MS. BANNIGAN: Good morning, your Honor. Megan
14	Bannigan on behalf of Stockx.
15	THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Bannigan.
16	MS. SABA: Kathryn Saba also on behalf of Stockx.
17	THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Saba. You have to talk
18	up. If you want to be a litigator, you have to speak up nice
19	and loud.
20	MS. BEATTIE: Hannah Beattie, also on behalf of
21	Stockx.
22	THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Beattie. Please be
23	seated.
24	So I brought you in because, having reviewed the

documents, I was left with the following two questions: To

Nike, I don't get it; and to Stockx, I don't get it.

I don't understand why you're in a swivet but you can't show it to your clients.

And, Nike, I really don't understand the redaction. I don't understand why that material is highly confidential, outside attorneys' eyes only.

So who's going to answer? Mr. Miller?

MR. MILLER: Yes, your Honor. I'd be happy to address your question. I think the context here is important.

THE COURT: I get it that they are counterfeiters and you can't trust them as far as you could throw them.

MR. MILLER: Yes, your Honor. The reason why that document, in particular, was designated as outside counsel eyes only is because Nike made test purchases.

THE COURT: That's not a secret. It's not a secret that Nike makes test purchases. Correct me if I'm wrong. All you have to do is look at the docket of the court and know that people who are policing their trademarks are making test purchases.

MR. MILLER: Sure. That's correct, your Honor. The particular test purchase that was done here, the information on the label shows the number of the test purchase in the series that was done and the timeframe. So the reason why --

THE COURT: So that gives a sense of approximately how many test purchases are being made.

MR. MILLER: Yes. It's a piece of the larger puzzle, the mosaic that your Honor mentioned on the phone call last week. What our concern was, when we looked at those very carefully -- and we looked at every document that we produced with four members of our team.

And we thought very carefully about what pieces of information we could safely share with Stockx or keep to their outside counsel eyes only in order to essentially keep the larger piece of the puzzle closely safeguarded.

Your Honor, our concern was that if Stockx employees could see more information about the pieces of the puzzle, they could piece together information about Nike's test purchases and who was making them on their platform.

THE COURT: How does this show who was making them?

MR. MILLER: Well, this one particular document does

not in and of itself. But once we start opening the door and

letting out more pieces, the puzzle becomes easier to put

together.

THE COURT: You're talking in platitudes. That is the mosaic theory, that if you let out little pieces, you can put the whole thing together.

MR. MILLER: This says that there were a number of test purchases. I'm not clear during what timeframe. I'm not clear who made them. And at least some of them were made in January of this year. Right?

I am just lost as to why, again, recognizing, as I say, that every counterfeiter knows that there are test purchases being made and anybody who works in this area of the law knows that test purchases are made. And generally, they're not being made under real names.

So help me understand what you're really protecting here, other than the answer is maybe this is a tiny little piece. And, you know, what, in truth, if you lose on this little piece, it doesn't matter.

MR. MILLER: Yes, your Honor. This is a tiny little piece. And perhaps you're right that on this one individual document, that may be true. But if there are more pieces that come together, our concern is that Stockx will be able to identify, by looking at the bigger picture and seeing all of the different purchases that are made, the strategy that's used, how many of each style, what sizes, when and look and see and put all those pieces together to form the picture and essentially try to evade or hinder the test purchases. Right?

THE COURT: I don't know how you do that. Even if you know that there are test purchases being made and that they're being made of size X, which I presume varies from product to product maybe. I don't know what they're selling.

MR. MILLER: These are all sneakers, your Honor.

THE COURT: These were all the same size, but you didn't block off the size.

MR. MILLER: That's right. In our proposed redactions, we are not proposing to redact the label that appears on the original goods.

THE COURT: Are these counterfeit goods?

MR. MILLER: That one was confirmed to be a counterfeit, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I'm no closer to understanding.

Ms. Bannigan, now the attention shifts to you. I don't understand in a million years why, in order to adequately represent your client, you need to provide the information to the client of the information that Nike has indicated is outside counsel's eyes only.

MS. BANNIGAN: Thank you, your Honor.

Stockx has been having an unusual and surprisingly difficult time nailing down what the allegations in the complaint are. Nike amended the complaint and said that they conducted an investigation.

Through this investigation, they identified four counterfeits. Those are the allegations in the complaint. We served an interrogatory asking that they identify the counterfeits shoes that they identified.

They referred to a document. We actually had to go back and forth with them and spent an exceedingly -- spending a large amount of time and a lot of money getting them to simply put the Bates numbers of the documents they're referring to.

The Bates numbers that they're referring to, there aren't that many of them. And several of them are these documents denying that was raised that are highly confidential, outside counsel's eyes only.

We need this information to do an investigation.

Stockx takes very seriously these counterfeiting allegations.

We disagree that Stockx is a counterfeiter, and we need to investigate them to be able to fully put together our defenses.

THE COURT: Understood. So how does the information on the white tag advance that?

MS. BANNIGAN: So the information on the white tag -- it includes a purchase date, which we need --

THE COURT: No, it doesn't. It includes a purchase month.

MS. BANNIGAN: Well, it includes a timeframe. We don't have a purchase date, but the best that we have --

THE COURT: It's a month. I assume you sold literally thousands of items during the month of January.

MS. BANNIGAN: Well, it at least narrows it down, your Honor, and gives us something. It includes the numerosity, how many they purchased. Nike is accusing us of being willful infringers. It matters how many they purchased and how many they found.

Now, the other thing I note --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Why?

Why does it matter how many they purchased and how	
many they found?	
MS. BANNIGAN: Well, there's an argument I believe	
Nike's argument is that Stockx is knowingly selling or allowing	
counterfeit shoes to be sold on its platform. That's	
absolutely not the case. Stockx tries very hard to not allow	
any counterfeiters' shoes to get through.	
THE COURT: I remember this involves non-fungible	
tokens which I thought were done. I thought we were done with	
them. But my law clerk tells me no; that at least boys in	
college still think they're important.	
So you are selling you are a marketplace for people	
who collect Nike shoes, all kinds of shoes, all kinds of	
things?	
MS. BANNIGAN: Yes, your Honor. All kinds of things.	
It's a marketplace for collectible goods where individuals can	
buy and trade goods that they believe hold value.	

THE COURT: So you're like an Ebay?

MS. BANNIGAN: Or a third-party marketplace in the way that Ebay is a third-party marketplace, but there are obvious differences from Ebay.

THE COURT: I'm not an Ebay person. So I wasn't intending to diss you with that.

MS. BANNIGAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So you are in the middle. People are

posting goods on your site, and you are the in-between to make the deal go. Nike says you're knowingly allowing counterfeits to be sold on your site.

Now continue. I sort of interrupted your flow.

MS. BANNIGAN: Thank you, your Honor.

So the number of counterfeits that got through based on how many were tests, that's going to be important. But this is a broader issue of allowing us to know that has been identified.

We had sent over to Nike nine documents. We, frankly, thought they were mistakes; that they were just misdesignated. That happens sometimes. We were very surprised when they dug in and said that this is the most sensitive trade secret information.

The burden, frankly, is on Nike to show why they would be harmed if we have this information. They have not done practice. The sample that they gave you -- they gave you a sample of the shoeboxes.

But the documents being identified are actually more. There are pictures of the actual shoe. There are tracking numbers to show that would help us figure out when these were purchased and the dates that they were shipped. I have copies of the documents.

THE COURT: Why do you need to know the dates they were purchased by Nike or by Nike's investigators?

MS. BANNIGAN: So Stockx can do an investigation to see where did these shoes come from. Did they go Stockx's authentication process. Did somebody from Stockx look at them to determine are there any signs of counterfeiting. There's a lot that goes into Stockx's process to try to prevent counterfeits.

THE COURT: Isn't that going to be derived from the bar code?

Again, I'm not trying to be difficult. I just don't -- it's like you are in a pitched battle over something where I don't see either side's position.

MS. BANNIGAN: I understand, your Honor. It's part of a broader issue for Stockx that it has just been so difficult to get any information from Nike about these shoes.

We are concerned about -- we've raised concerns that these are just a sample of documents. We thought these were the easy sample that we raised. We do not want to be here before your Honor bothering the Court with these disputes.

We are going to have several more disputes over information. We have several pending, not about just designations but about information at all.

And it's about setting a standard that's in the protective order and abiding by that standard as to what types of information has to be turned over. We're very concerned that -- we highly negotiated this protective order.

It actually took weeks to negotiate because there is a difference of opinion as to whether there should be an outside-counsel-only level at all. We compromised because we didn't want to burden the Court with that position.

But it was under the understanding that we would have that level of confidentiality that it would seriously be trade secret or the most sensitive commercial information that is being designated. We just don't understand how Nike has met their burden to designate this.

But I hear your Honor. We do not want to burden the Court with disputes of this nature going forward.

THE COURT: I don't want to be burdened with disputes of this nature going forward.

Mr. Miller, did you want to add anything?

MS. DUVDEVANI: If I may respond to that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. DUVDEVANI: Our complaint allegations when we amended -- and you're right. This case started off over non-fungible tokens. And then after we filed, we saw indeed Nike shopped the market. It is not a secret that brands like Nike shop a market. What is not known is the volume, the length of time, etc.

So, as Mr. Miller said, when we saw this whole piece of the puzzle, everything that we did to investigate counterfeiting activity on the Stockx platform, we looked at it

holistically. And then we had the difficult position to figure out which piece of the puzzles that we could de-designate and which would be kept as outside counsel's eyes only.

And in all honesty, your Honor, when we had to make the judgment calls, we did err on the side of caution, given the importance of the anti-counterfeiting initiatives that are really Nike's most prized possessions to prevent counterfeiting.

They work with intelligence organizations on this.

There is a very, very small subset of individuals at Nike that even understands how this is done.

THE COURT: How it's done is something more than making test purchases and figuring out whether they're counterfeits?

MS. DUVDEVANI: Well, it's the figuring out whether or not they're counterfeit that tends to be the really, really secret information that nobody knows.

THE COURT: That I get. If this was telling me how Nike can tell the difference between a really good counterfeit and a real pair of Nike shoes, I'm there.

MS. DUVDEVANI: This, in and of itself, does not. But what it does provide to somebody who is accused of counterfeiting is the fact that there is a volume being shopped in the same period of time.

We don't know Stockx's systems. We don't know what we

can decipher. But I can represent to your Honor that these test purchases were all made with the same alias to the same P.O. box with the same credit card.

So once we start breaking it down and giving them more pieces of the puzzle, they are potentially able to decipher that. When they see these volume of purchases going through, they can do things like block the sale, which they do sometimes because everything goes through the authentication process, according to the Stockx platform.

Maybe they'll say, sorry. You're not going to get your product because it failed verification if they think it is a right holder who is trying to make these purchases. That is why we designated these.

I will also say, your Honor, that when Stockx came to Nike with this dispute, we almost immediately tried to offer this compromise, as in somewhat robotic fashion --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. What compromise?

MS. DUVDEVANI: Of redaction. We would redact just the label that the investigator put in. We will give you the rest of the imagery. They would not even respond to the proposal.

THE COURT: Okay. Again, I kind of don't want to get into that, we said this. They said that. They didn't get back to us. I'm more concerned about sort of the Uber issue of is this material and is this consistent with the decisions you

were making.

These do not say that they were all made from the same credit card with the same alias. That may be evidence from other documents that tie in to these.

Is that what you're telling me?

MS. DUVDEVANI: Yes. If you look at the larger piece of the puzzle, yes. I think that they could decipher that, your Honor. Yes. I don't know how their systems work. That's my point. If they know -- for example, one of the labels said purchased --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Just to interrupt.

The number of the purchases and the date does not tell them that they're all made with the same credit card from the same alias. It doesn't even necessarily tell you that like these were made — number 1112 was made in January, but it's unclear whether 1 to 1111 were also made in January or whether they were made in December, November, or October.

MS. DUVDEVANI: I agree with that, your Honor. That is true. Our concern, when we were scrutinizing as to what to designate as outside counsel's eyes only -- again, Stockx's outside counsel received all of this documentation.

We disagree that we weren't being transparent. Stockx knows that we pointed them to the four counterfeits. We know that since this case began, we've identified almost a hundred other pairs that Stockx has sold to downstream consumers, and

they know every single one of the pairs. I don't know why they're saying that they don't.

THE COURT: But that's out of how many test purchases?

MS. DUVDEVANI: Well, the test purchases are besides

that. Nike found four through their own test purchases in a

two-month period, which is certainly --

THE COURT: Out of how many shoes did they sell?

MS. BANNIGAN: I think a hundred. I don't know

offhand, but that's basically 4 percent. They say they have a

hundred percent guaranteed authenticity. So right there, there

are four that went through. When you think about the volume of

Nike shoes --And Ms. Bannigan is right. They sell a lot of

other products.

The vast majority of Stockx products that are being sold are Nike and Jordan shoes. That's how the company was founded. That is how they make the vast majority of their money.

Nike was very alarmed by that number. And as I noted, in May and June alone, we found one consumer who was sold 37 pairs of fake Jordans through the Stockx website. And they know because we approached Stockx immediately once we reached out to that consumer.

We acknowledge, your Honor, that we are being overcautious with this information, which is why, when Stockx approached us, we immediately said we would redact the label

and allow their folks to see the box, to the extent that gives them information.

They haven't requested a notice to inspection the shoes. They could of course always do that. We would make them accessible. I'm not sure what they would glean from it. I know Ms. Bannigan noted that they wanted to see if the shoes went through the authentication process. But they claim every shoe goes through an authentication process.

THE COURT: Understood.

MS. DUVDEVANI: Another thing I want to say, your Honor -- and I do not want you to do a pox on both of our houses if we did.

THE COURT: You are so close to a pox on both of your houses.

MS. DUVDEVANI: But I'm not going to show you Stockx's documents today, and I'm just going to keep my mouth shut. It really is a very important protective order. Going forward, we will try to be more discerning about what we designate.

Again, if Stockx raises disputes, we will offer immediate compromises. But we do think that the probation is very important for Nike.

THE COURT: I don't quarrel with the notion that attorneys' eyes only serves useful purposes during discovery. What I ask you to do is to work together cooperatively and collegially.

To the extent this is a good example of the sort of disputes, you have my reaction. I don't think either position made a lot of sense to me. I get the mosaic. I just don't get it on these particular materials, and I continue to not understand why Stockx needed to see the labels.

So if you've got legitimate issues that you really can't work out, you always have the Court available to you.

But I don't have a lot of tolerance for these sorts of disputes where a neutral third party doesn't see either position.

That is not a good place for either of you to be in.

So there is not a pox on both of your houses. I still love you all dearly. You can all come back any time you want to, but try to work this out.

All of that said, where are we in the discovery of this case?

MS. DUVDEVANI: Yes, your Honor. So substantial completion of document discovery is done. Nike has other smaller productions to make. Stockx may say the same.

Depositions are all being calendared right now. It's going to be a very busy holiday season for us. But we are working very hard to get dates for every single witness that's been put on initial disclosures or that the parties need.

Whether or not we might beg for an extra week at the end of January to finish some depositions up, as some of Nike's witnesses in particular are overseas, may be the case. But we

```
MBAYNIKC
      took your Honor very serious when you said good cause at this
 1
      point, if we need more time.
 2
 3
                (Continued on next page)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

MBA5nikC2

THE COURT: Look. Obviously if you have got, there are people that can't be rescheduled, that's fine. I can duly adjust schedules for that. So, it sounds like -- but you should be done with your fact discovery early next year.

MS. DUVDEVANI: That is what we are aiming towards, and so far, again, it will be a very busy holiday season but that's what we are working towards, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are the parties interested in a settlement conference?

MS. DUVDEVANI: We did have a settlement conference before Judge Netburn. She tried very hard to bring the parties together. We have had follow-up telephonic communications with her and written communications. Right now they're a bit at a standstill, but certainly if we think there is more room for compromise I have no problem calling Megan and letting her know that.

THE COURT: You have an open referral.

Ms. Bannigan, do you agree we are coming to the end of the discovery period?

MS. BANNIGAN: Yes, your Honor.

I think the parties still have some issues to work out but we are trying very hard to work those out without Court intervention. We will take the Court's comments today about working these out very seriously. I will say I am still personally a little perplexed about how what we are going to do

MBA5nikC2

about these pictures and whether I can show them to my client and how Nike thinks that it is going to keep — if Nike intends to rely on these shoes that an investigator purchased of evidence of counterfeits at trial, how they are going to do that without naming the investigator or authenticating it or how — but as long as we can work together and Stockx can get the information so we can identify these shoes so we can do a full investigation, we are of course willing to work with Nike but we haven't been able to get that information yet. But we will go back to them to work on this.

THE COURT: OK. Look they obviously need that information, they're going to need to do that so that they defend the case by showing, presumably, that they have got reasonable processes in place and sometimes things get through but their processes are good, but I don't know how they show that unless they know what fell through the cracks. So try to work these things out between you.

I will see you again after fact discovery is complete.

I presume there is going to need to be expert discovery in this case?

MS. DUVDEVANI: Yes, your Honor. There will be a lot of experts during the expert discovery period in the case.

THE COURT: Are NFTs now done? The whole issue with the NFTs is a moot point.

MS. DUVDEVANI: No, your Honor. NFTs are still a

MBA5nikC2

large component of this case. At this point I would say there is three buckets: There is trademark infringement relating to the NFTs, there is counterfeiting, and there is associated false advertising relating to the counterfeiting. THE COURT: Great. OK. All right. Everybody have a wonderful holiday and I will see you early next year. MS. DUVDEVANI: Thank you, your Honor. MS. BANNIGAN: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you.